

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,999	09/05/2003	Eric A. Schon	5199-23	8821
56949	7590 09/26/2006		EXAMINER	
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY			CHEN, SHIN LIN	
399 PARK A			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK,	, NY 10020		1632	
			DATE MAILED: 00/26/2006	.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/655,999	SCHON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shin-Lin Chen	1632
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was precised to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-91 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-91 are subject to restriction and/or example. 	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		•
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte

Application/Control Number: 10/655,999

Art Unit: 1632

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-17, drawn to a method for introducing a functional peptide encoded by a plant or protist nucleic acid sequence into a mitochondrion of a mammalian cell by introducing a nucleic acid construct comprising a plant or protest nucleic acid encoding the peptide into a mammalian cell to produce a transformed cell, classified in classes 435 and 536, subclasses 455, and 23.6 and 23.7, respectively.

Page 2

- II. Claims 18-31, drawn to a method for correcting a phenotypic deficiency in a mammal that results from a mutation in a mitochondrial peptide by identifying the mitochondrial peptide having the mutation and introducing a nucleic acid construct comprising a plant or protist nucleic acid encoding the peptide into a mammalian cell to produce a transformed cell, classified in classes 514 and 536, subclasses 44, and 23.6 and 23.7, respectively.
- III. Claims 32-41, drawn to a method for treating a mitochondrial disorder in a subject comprising administering to the subject a functional plant or protist peptide to treat said mitochondrial disorder, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
- IV. Claims 42-47 and 67-71, drawn to a method for treating a mitochondrial disorder in a subject comprising administering to the subject a nucleic acid sequence encoding the functional plant or protist peptide to treat said mitochondrial disorder, and a pharmaceutical composition comprising said nucleic acid sequence, classified in classes 514 and 536, subclasses 44, and 23.6 and 23.7, respectively.

Art Unit: 1632

V. Claims 48-66, drawn to an expression vector for use in introducing a functional peptide encoded by an algal nucleic acid sequence into a mitochondrion of a mammal, comprising a nucleic acid sequence encoding *Chlamydomonas* reinhardtii ATPase 6 subunit of F0F1-ATP synthase or the mitochondrial-targeting signal thereof, and a mammalian cell transformed with said expression vector classified in classes 435 and 424, subclasses 320.1 and 93.2, respectively.

VI. Claims 72-91, drawn to a method for introducing a functional peptide into a mitochondrion comprising introducing a nucleic acid construct comprising a nucleic acid sequence encoding a peptide into a eukaryotic cell to produce a transformed cell, classified in classes 435 and 536, subclasses 455 and 23.1, respectively.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are a method for introducing a nucleic acid sequence encoding a functional plant or protist peptide into a mitochondrion of a mammalian cell vs. a method for correcting a phenotypic deficiency in a mammal that results from a mutation in a mitochondrial peptide. They are drawn to materially different methods that differ at least in objectives, method steps, reagents and/or dosages used, schedules used, response variables, and criteria for success. They have different classifications and require separate search. There would be serious burden for examiner to search both groups. Thus, group I and group II are patentably distinct from each other. Similarly, group I and group

IV, group II and group VI, or group IV and group VI are patentably distinct from each other for the same reasons.

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are a method for introducing a nucleic acid sequence encoding a functional plant or protist peptide into a mitochondrion of a mammalian cell vs. a method for treating a mitochondrial disorder in a subject comprising administering to the subject a functional plant or protist peptide. A nucleic acid sequence and a peptide differ in chemical structures, physical properties, and biological functions. They are drawn to materially different methods that differ at least in objectives, method steps, reagents and/or dosages used, schedules used, response variables, and criteria for success. They have different classifications and require separate search. There would be serious burden for examiner to search both groups. Thus, group I and group III are patentably distinct from each other. Similarly, group III and group VI are patentably distinct from each other for the same reasons.

Inventions I and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the expression vector of group V can be used as a probe for detecting the nucleic acid sequence encoding *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* ATPase 6 subunit of F0F1-ATP synthase or for producing a recombinant protein in vitro as opposed to transform a

Art Unit: 1632

mammalian cell. Thus, group I and group V are patentably distinct from each other. Similarly, group V and group VI are patentably distinct from each other for the same reasons.

Inventions I and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are a method for introducing a nucleic acid sequence encoding a functional plant or protist peptide into a mitochondrion of a mammalian cell vs. a method for introducing a nucleic acid sequence encoding a functional peptide into a eukaryotic cell. The nucleotide sequence and the target cell between groups I and VI are different. They are drawn to materially different methods that differ at least method steps, reagents and/or dosages used, schedules used, response variables, and criteria for success. They have different classifications and require separate search. There would be serious burden for examiner to search both groups. Thus, group I and group VI are patentably distinct from each other.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are a method for correcting a phenotypic deficiency in a mammal that results from a mutation in a mitochondrial peptide by using the recited nucleic acid construct vs. a method for treating a mitochondrial disorder in a subject comprising administering to the subject a functional plant or protist peptide. A nucleic acid sequence and a peptide differ in chemical structures, physical properties, and biological functions. They are drawn to materially different methods that differ at least in objectives, method steps, reagents and/or dosages used, schedules used, response

Application/Control Number: 10/655,999

Art Unit: 1632

variables, and criteria for success. They have different classifications and require separate search. There would be serious burden for examiner to search both groups. Thus, group II and group III are patentably distinct from each other. Similarly, group III and group IV are patentably distinct from each other for the same reasons.

Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are a method for correcting a phenotypic deficiency in a mammal that results from a mutation in a mitochondrial peptide by using the recited nucleic acid construct vs. a method for treating a mitochondrial disorder in a subject comprising administering to the subject a nucleic acid sequence encoding the functional plant or protist peptide. A method of correcting a phenotypic deficiency in a mammal that results from a mutation in a mitochondrial peptide and a method for treating a mitochondrial disorder in a subject are drawn to different scientific considerations. They have different designs and different mode of operations. They are drawn to materially different methods that differ at least in objectives, method steps, reagents and/or dosages used, schedules used, response variables, and criteria for success. There would be serious burden for examiner to search both groups and they require separate search. Thus, group II and group IV are patentably distinct from each other.

Inventions II and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP

Application/Control Number: 10/655,999

Art Unit: 1632

§ 806.05(h). In the instant case the expression vector of group V can be used as a probe for detecting the nucleic acid sequence encoding *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* ATPase 6 subunit of F0F1-ATP synthase or for producing a recombinant protein in vitro as opposed to correct a phenotypic deficiency in a mammal. Thus, group II and group V are patentably distinct from each other. Similarly, group IV and group V are patentably distinct from each other for the same reasons.

Inventions III and V are unrelated because the product of group V is not used or otherwise involved in the process of group III.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Art Unit: 1632

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Lin Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-0726. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 am to 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Shin-Lin Chen, Ph.D.

SHIN-LIN CHEN

4 Whon